DOCUMENT RESUME

HE 000 391

ED 026 959

By-Valien, Preston

Undergraduate Educational Opportunity Programs.

Pub Date 4 Dec 68

Note-11p.; Paper presented at 8th Annual Meeting of the Council of Graduate Schools, San Francisco, California, December 4, 1968.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.65

Descriptors-Disadvantaged Youth, *Educational Equality, *Educational Legislation, *Educationally Disadvantaged, Educational Programs, Federal Aid, Federal Legislation, *Higher Education, High School Students, *Undergraduate Study

The lack of financial resources is no longer seen as the only hurdle to be surmounted by the poor potential college student. The Upward Bound program was created in 1964 to provide cultural and educational activities during the summer for disadvantaged high school students. The Educational Talen t Search program began in 1965 as a supplement to Upward Bound and is designed to identify and encourage bright high school students to enter college. The new Special Services for Disadvantaged Students programs may provide (1) counseling, tutorial or other services to correct academic deficiencies, (2) career guidance, placement, and other services to facilitate students' continuance or reentrance in higher education programs, or (3) identification and motivation of students to pursue graduate or professional studies. Many universities have indicated a willingness to recruit "high-risk" students, but there is some confusion about how to provide the academic, financial, and counseling services that they need. With the legislative tools now available, the possibilities for creative cooperation at the local level is endless. Individual colleges and universities or groups of institutions will be able to design and operate comprehensive programs in cooperation with community groups, city government, and local industry in order to increase higher educational opportunity for children of specific deprived neighborhoods. (WM)

ED026959

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

Remarks by Preston Valien
Acting Associate Commissioner for Higher Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE000 391

Valien

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS*

Remarks by Preston Valien
Acting Associate Commissioner for Higher Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

I am particularly happy to be participating with you today in a discussion about our responsibilities toward the disadvantaged student in graduate school. It was not too long ago that improved higher educational opportunity--especially as it relates to post-bacculaureate studies--was rather far down on the Nation's list of priority issues in education. The fact that the Council is today devoting an entire plenary session to this problem is a sign that the higher education leadership is beginning to see our responsibilities toward underprivileged youth in a new and clearer focus.

I have been asked to address myself specifically to undergraduate educational opportunity programs. Such programs are, of course, of vital importance in preparing the disadvantaged student for entrance into a demanding program of graduate studies. To the extent the undergraduate opportunity programs are successful in helping educationally deprived youngsters to catch up with their more privileged classmates, there will be fewer "disadvantaged" students for us to deal with at the graduate level. We, of course, look forward to the day when an improved public school system can equalize opportunity at an even earlier age, so that every American child

HE000 391

---

*Remarks by Preston Valien, Acting Associate Commissioner for Higher Education, before the 8th Annual Meeting of the Council of Graduate Schools, San Francisco, California, December 4, 1968

can pursue those educational goals that are consistent with his interests and abilities. But there are in the United States today many thousands of young men and women who have never been given the chance to show what they can do. It is our job to see that they receive that chance before it is too late--for them and for the nation.

Perhaps we should begin by asking what an undergraduate opportunity program really is. We in the bureaucracy are prone to use the word "program" in a variety of contexts, but in the Office of Education it generally refers to a Congressionally authorized activity that is designed to relate to a definable educational problem--or category, if you will--through the massive infusion of federal funds.

The first categorical aid program addressed specifically to the problem of providing increased opportunity for higher education came in 1958 with the passage of the National Defense Education Act whose Tenth Anniversary you are observing so signally tomorrow. The NDEA Student Loan program was followed in subsequent years by the College Work-Study, Educational Opportunity Grants, and Guaranteed Loan programs--all of which were intended to help break down the financial barrier to higher education.

In 1964 the Congress included Upward Bound as part of the Economic Opportunity Act, and with that action introduced a new dimension to the concept of equal educational opportunity. No longer was the lack of financial resources seen as the only hurdle the poor but potentially college-able youngster had to surmount; cultural and educational deprivation were recognized as equally disabling factors in the lonely struggle for self-improvement. Upward Bound, then, was based on the premise that high schoolers could be taught the value of education and the worth of self-respect in a summer preparation program carried on through the auspices of colleges, universities and residential secondary schools. The Educational Talent Search program, designed to identify bright youngsters and encourage them to continue their education beyond the high school, was created the following year as a supplement to Upward Bound.

Meanwhile, back at the institutions, progress in enrolling large numbers of "high-risk" disadvantaged students was proceeding at a pace which could most charitably be called "cautious." To be sure, a small number of colleges and universities had made a real commitment to recruit disadvantaged students and provide them with the financial, academic, and counseling services which are so necessary for their success. But in the main, commitment and/or resources were lacking.

The picture began to change markedly with the death of Dr. Martin Luther King in April of this year. Pressure from students and faculty convinced many college administrations to press forward with recruitment of "high-risk" disadvantaged minority group students. At about the same time John Egerton completed and published an important little booklet commissioned by the Southern Education Foundation called, appropriately enough, Higher Education for High Risk Students. Egerton's study described the "high-risk" programs which are currently underway at some of our public and private universities, and encouraged other institutions to follow this promising lead.

The situation at this moment is rather confused and unclear. A great many institutions have for the first time indicated a willingness to reach out to that group of young people who have been historically denied the opportunity for higher education. But there is a rather widespread ignorance about the specific techniques to be used. Institutions are asking such questions as: What kind of recruiting devices are the most effective in selecting disadvantaged candidates for admissions? To what extent should traditional admissions standards be altered to allow for potential talent that is inadequately measured by tests and high school records? What kinds of pre-college "transitional" programs are effective? Are lightened course loads and special compensatory courses a real necessity? What kinds of

special counseling programs are needed? How can the disadvantaged youngster best be integrated into the regular student body? And perhaps most important, how can we meet the costs of all this new activity? Needless to say, nobody has all the right answers. We are all going through a kind of adjust-as-you-go process; for the press of history no longer allows us the luxury of operating long range pilot projects to determine exactly the right combinations of inputs prior to launching a full-scale assault on unequal educational opportunity.

Nevertheless, there are some hopeful signs that order is beginning to emerge from the chaos. A number of higher education associations have begun to disseminate information among their respective memberships on the "high-risk" programs already underway at specific institutions. The Office of Education is planning to sponsor in this fiscal year a number of projects under the Education Professions Development Act designed to train college faculty and administrators in the problems of recruiting and retaining disadvantaged students from specific minority groups. And the recently enacted Higher Education Amendments of 1968 has given us some new weapons that we can effectively bring to bear in the fight against inequality of opportunity. This new legislation provides for the transfer of Upward Bound from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education effective July 1, 1969, creates a new

categorical program designed to support special supportive services for disadvantaged students who have been admitted to college, and links these two programs with the Talent Search program.

It is not without significance, I believe, that the legislation specifies that Special Services for Disadvantaged Students programs may provide, among other things, for

(A) counseling, tutorial, or other educational services, including special summer programs, to remedy such students' academic deficiencies,

(B) career guidance, placement, or other student personnel services to encourage or facilitate such students' continuance or reentrance in higher education programs, or

(C) identification, encouragement, and counseling of any such students with a view to their undertaking a program of graduate or professional education.

It would be difficult to overstate the importance of these new developments. For the first time we have the tools to make a real break-through in creating equal opportunity programs that will be truly comprehensive from the viewpoint of the disadvantaged student.

individual institutions, and perhaps more significantly, groups of institutions, will be able to design and operate programs specifically geared to a nearby city. Such programs could combine several or all of the following five components:

1. A Talent Search project, perhaps operated in cooperation with community groups, which will identify potentially college-able youngsters while they are still in high school.

2. An Upward Bound program, operated under the aegis of one or more of the cooperating institutions, which can help to prepare the identified students for a higher education experience beginning in the summer before their senior year.

3. A joint agreement among the cooperating institutions to admit all successful graduates of the local Upward Bound program.

4. A Special Services program, again operated on a cooperative basis, to help insure that the disadvantaged students, once admitted, will have a fighting chance to be successful.

3. A student financial aid program, where possible involving advance commitment of support, to provide the disadvantaged students with the motivation and resources his individual situation seems to require.

The possibilities for creative co-operation at the local level--among colleges and universities, community groups, city government, and even local industry--are almost endless. A consortium of institutions might well, for example, design a joint with the local model cities program in an effort to increase higher education opportunity for the children of a specific depressed neighborhood.

You will recall that we earlier defined an undergraduate opportunity program in terms of the massive infusion of federal funds. But it would now appear that such a definition does not get down to the meat of the problem. The only meaningful opportunity program--from the point of view of a bright, and probably bitter, teenager in a big city slum--is one that provides all of the kinds of personalized help he needs to make the great leap toward a more purposeful, satisfying and productive life. That kind of program can only be constructed at the local level--using the combined imagination and resources that can be found in sectors of the community that in the past have tended to go their own separate ways. It is past time for this dialog to begin.

There are some, I should point out, who apparently would not completely agree with this conclusion. We have heard some prominent voices recently urging that this drive for equal higher educational opportunity for the disadvantaged should be slowed. It is not in the best interests of higher education, we are told, that minority group Americans should be given favorable treatment by our colleges and universities, especially if this might diminish in any way the resources available to others. One critic was particularly concerned that American Negroes might take places in institutions of higher education away from foreign students--"I would hate to see foreign students suffer," he was quoted as saying in a newspaper interview. The tragic irony of this statement is all too apparent. It seems to be saying that only privileged white Americans are rightful members of the higher education club. If there are a few spaces left over for competition between two so-called "alien" groups--foreign students on the one hand and young black and brown Americans on the other--the nod should obviously go to our good friends across the sea.

Aside from the moral issue raised by such a view, it displays a surprising lack of insight into the possibilities for the self-renewal of individual institutions and, indeed, of the entire nation. This society--if it is going to survive--will have to make progress toward developing a new kind of mutually-respected cultural pluralism that was not needed in the days of the melting pot. The impetus for such a movement can come only from the young men and women--of all races

and classes and of other nations as well--who will be the opinion makers of tomorrow. What kind of higher education is it that does not give them the opportunity to know and understand their fellow man? What kind of university is it that does not dare to open a dialog with those groups of Americans who have been denied a voice for so many generations?

President James A. Perkins of Cornell University, in a ringing speech at the United Negro College Fund Symposium and Award Dinner on Tuesday (December 3, 1968) of this week said:

> "No American university can consider itself a great university if it is not participating in this new movement to provide equal educational opportunity for disadvantaged black students."

I am confident that our colleges and universities will not turn back from the great goal of equal opportunity they have only so recently begun to pursue, that they will in the end choose conscience over tradition, and that perhaps--just perhaps--this collective decision will finally lead the nation to the fulfillment of her magnificent promise.